STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to revise the standard rate application filing forms and instructions previously adopted in Case No. U-15895.	)))))	Case No. U-18238

At the July 31, 2017 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing, Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Sally A. Talberg, Chairman
Hon. Norman J. Saari, Commissioner
Hon. Rachael A. Eubanks, Commissioner

ORDER

Following the enactment of 2008 PA 286, amending 1939 PA 3 (Act 3), MCL 460.1 *et seq.*, the Commission adopted its current standard rate application filing forms and instructions in Case No. U-15895.

On December 21, 2016, 2016 PA 341 (Act 341), a subsequent amendment to Act 3, was signed into law, with an effective date of April 20, 2017. Pursuant to Act 341, the Commission is now charged with deciding most rate cases within 10 months,[1] versus the previous statutorily-allotted timeframe of 12 months for all rate cases.

[1] See MCL 460.6a(5).

In that regard, on January 20, 2017, the Commission opened this docket to consider modifications needed for its current standard rate application filing forms and instructions,[2] directing the Commission Staff (Staff) to file proposals with necessary updates and allowing any interested persons to submit comments, concerns, and alternative recommendations to the Staff's proposals. On March 28, 2017, the Commission then issued a subsequent order in this docket, amending the dates on which the foregoing were required to be filed and also allowing interested persons to submit final comments to the Staff's eventual final proposal by June 21, 2017.

With that, following initial comments from several interested persons to the Staff's Draft Proposal and two subsequent collaborative proceedings held on May 15, 2017, and May 22, 2017, a Final Proposal was filed by the Staff on June 8, 2017. Thereafter, final comments to the Staff's Final Proposal were then filed by Detroit Thermal, LLC (Detroit Thermal); Michigan Electric and Gas Association (MEGA);[3] the Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity (ABATE); the Michigan Department of the Attorney General (Attorney General); and Clint Reamer, on behalf of solar producers[4] – final comments of which are addressed in the following paragraphs based on core, focal categories.

[2] Under MCL 460.6a(8), "The commission shall adopt standard rate application filing forms and instructions for use in all general rate cases filed by utilities whose rates are regulated by the commission. . . . The commission may modify the standard rate application forms and instructions adopted under this subsection."

[3] The final comments submitted by MEGA are joint comments from Consumers Energy Company, DTE Electric Company, DTE Gas Company, and MEGA's members.

[4] Albeit untimely, final comments from Clint Reamer were taken into consideration in the rendering of this order.

New Filing Requirements

In its final comments to the Staff's Final Proposal, MEGA chiefly contends that "Act 341's requirement that rate cases be decided in ten months . . . does not expand the statutory scope of the Commission's consideration of rate case applications or create need for substantially expanded rate case initial filing requirements." MEGA's final comments, p. 2.

The Commission, however, disagrees. MCL 460.6a(8) affords the Commission discretion in modifying its standard rate application forms and instructions. Further, given the condensed timeframe in which the Commission is statutorily mandated to reach a final decision in stated rate cases, the Commission finds that the additional, specifically-prescribed, initial filing requirements,[5] at the onset of a case, will actually prove to be beneficial for all involved, thus furthering the Commission's goal of reaching a final decision that is well-informed, thorough, and timely-executed. Additionally, while MEGA also points out that the rate case filing requirements are being addressed through a Commission order, versus through the adoption of rules under the Administrative Procedures Act, this mechanism, used in Case No. U-15895 and repeated in this proceeding, is an authorized vehicle for the Commission to establish rate case filing requirements. Moreover, MCL 460.6a(1) specifically states that "[a] petition or application is considered complete *if it complies with the rate application filing forms and instructions adopted under subsection (8)*" (emphasis added), making no reference to the adoption of rules and procedures contemplated under MCL 460.6a(4). As a result, if a rate case application is incomplete (i.e., does not comply with the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements set forth in this order), the clock for

[5] The additional, specifically-prescribed, initial filing requirements, largely located in Part III of the Staff's Final Proposal, aside from Attachments 1 and 13, are mostly those items that, in the past, were generally requested by the Staff during the audit and discovery phases of every rate case.

the Commission to reach a final decision or issue a final order under MCL 460.6a will not begin to run.

Next, both Detroit Thermal and MEGA raise the notion of waivers – with Detroit Thermal requesting such exception specifically for "unduly burdensome [filing] requirements" (Detroit Thermal's final comments, pp. 2-3), and MEGA requesting a provision for waivers, along with a transition period, to allow filing requirements to be adjusted on a case-by-case basis, "based on good cause and practical considerations," and to allow utilities time to comply with the new filing requirements. MEGA's final comments, pp. 20-21.

In reply to these suggestions, the Commission will, as a matter of course, waive Attachments 2-11 under Part III as a filing requirement for all rate cases filed by utilities through July 31, 2018, to allow ample time for utilities to become acclimated to such Attachments and the format in which the information is requested.[6] Further, and by specifically providing this waiver, the Commission believes that this should alleviate MEGA's "form over substance" concern that the requirements under Part III will lead to applications being deemed incomplete by the Staff, along with MEGA's and Detroit Thermal's concerns that alternative, non-existent, non-relevant, unreasonable, and burdensome data/analyses should not be part of the mandatory filing requirements – at least until July 31, 2018. The Commission notes, however, that the specifically-prescribed items in Part III, if not provided at the time of application, will likely then be requested by the Staff during the audit and discovery phases of the rate case and, if relevant and not produced, failure to provide such information could result in particular expenses being disallowed or the Staff utilizing an alternative method to procure the information that is being requested.

[6] If a utility voluntarily wishes to do so, the utility may opt out of the waiver by filing Attachments 2-11 under Part III at the time of filing its rate case application with the Commission.

With that all being said, however, Attachment 1 under Part III is required for all rate case applications to be filed on or after September 1, 2017, and Attachments 12 and 13 under Part III, along with all remaining portions of the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements, as amended and approved, are effective on the date this order is issued.[7]

And lastly, in a similar vein, while MCL 460.6a(8) does not mandate that the Commission adopt separate rate case filing forms and instructions for different types of utilities, the Commission, nevertheless, believes that there may be some validity to having alternative procedures for utilities deemed to be "small," as posited by Detroit Thermal, and approximately three years will provide sufficient time for the Commission to properly evaluate and analyze this suggestion. Therefore, the Commission will begin to revisit this suggestion no later than September 2020, along with the impact of the new rate case filing requirements on all other types of utilities.

10-Month Schedule

With regard to the 10-month schedule, as proposed in the Staff's Final Proposal, ABATE expresses concerns about the "truncated discovery period," particularly there being "no significant reduction for discovery turnaround" (ABATE's final comments, p. 2), while MEGA conversely contends that "it would be unreasonable to lengthen the time for Staff and intervenor filings beyond 120 days after the date the application is filed." MEGA's final comments, p. 7. MEGA

[7] Aside from Attachments 1 and 13, all other attachments under Part III of the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements, if filed by a utility at the time of application, are to be separately provided to the Staff, mirroring the process of how this type of information is currently provided to the Staff when a rate case is filed. In other words, Attachments 2-12 under Part III of the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements are not to be uploaded through the Commission's E-Dockets website at www.michigan.gov/mpscedockets, at any time.

does, however, contend that "filing rebuttal testimony should be at least 24 days from the filing of Staff and intervenor testimony, not the 21 days suggested by the ABATE and Staff." MEGA's final comments, p. 8.

In that regard, and after consideration, the Commission finds the Staff's proposed minimum timeframes, also adding in the timeframe for the pre-filing announcement (all on a calendar-day basis), to be most apt considering the new filing requirements and the need for the Commission to ensure timely decisions in specified rate cases:

Pre-Filing Announcement	(30)
Application	0
Prehearing Staff & Intervenor Filing	120
Rebuttal	21
Motion to Strike (MTS) Response to MTS Cross-Examination (CE) Starts	12
CE Ends	
Initial Brief	
Reply Brief	
PFD	
Exceptions	
Replies	
Order[8]	33

[8] MCL 460.6a(5) states that the Commission must "*reach* a *final decision* . . . within the 10-month period following the filing of [a] completed petition or application . . . ." (Emphasis added.) As a result, based on the Commission's legal interpretation of this directive, the Commission finds that an order settling the rights of the parties and disposing of all issues in controversy in a rate case, aside from enforcement of that decision (i.e., the issuance of tariff sheets, determining the appropriate rate design, etc.), will, at the very least, be issued by the Commission within 10 months. See *Black's Law Dictionary* (7th ed), p. 847, for the definition of "final decision." The Commission further finds that the distinction between the Legislature's use of the words "reach a final decision" versus "issue a final order," the latter of which is, in fact, used in a different context elsewhere within MCL 460.6a, also provides additional support for the Commission's interpretation.

The Commission further finds that, unless otherwise provided by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), discovery responses shall be provided within eight business days (*best efforts prior to Staff/Intervenor filing*) and five business days (*best efforts after Staff/Intervenor filing*), and all other timeframes, not specifically delineated above, shall be left to the ALJ's discretion.

Other Issues

a. Proprietary Information

In its final comments, ABATE contends that, if proprietary information is relied upon by a utility to support its rate application, such information should be made available to all parties in the case. The Attorney General, in a different thought, suggests language changes to the instructions pertaining to process guidelines for proprietary information, specifically suggesting language that would require utilities to "endeavor to enter into vendor contracts that permit the release of proprietary information and access to proprietary systems for purposes of regulatory disclosure and analysis by Staff and intervenors," require utilities to seek waivers from its vendors for contracts currently in existence, and allow utilities to withhold proprietary information from competitors. Attorney General's final comments, p. 3. Conversely, Detroit Thermal contends that only non-privileged proprietary information should be required to be given to the Staff, with the option of such information also being subject to a protective order, if so requested. And MEGA argues that a utility should not be required to provide "any" proprietary information requested by the Staff at the time of application, arguing that some proprietary information may be "contractually and legally prohibited from [being] disclos[ed] to third parties." MEGA's final comments, p. 16.

The Commission notes that the instructions specifically state, "If a utility is unable to provide . . . requested proprietary information due to license/contractual/legal restrictions, the utility shall

provide staff with verification of such restrictions." Staff's Final Proposal, p. 5. Further, a protective order, protecting non-public, confidential information and materials, may be requested by a utility in conjunction with its initial rate case application filing with the Commission (in addition to the previous practice of requesting the same during audit/discovery). And lastly, although the Attorney General suggests language changes to the instructions regarding process guidelines for proprietary information, the Commission has concerns that the majority of that suggested language (i.e., requiring utilities to "endeavor to enter into vendor contracts that permit the release of proprietary information") encroaches on a utility's ability to exercise control over its own general management decisions. See *Union Carbide Corp v Pub Serv Comm*, 431 Mich 135; 428 NW2d 322 (1988). Therefore, the Commission finds that further modification of the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements regarding proprietary information is unnecessary.

b. Publication Requirements

MEGA, in its final comments, suggests that the Commission consider changing the publication requirements for a notice of hearing in order to promote more efficient processing of rate cases, specifically suggesting that notice be given to the parties in the utility's last rate case and placed on the Commission's and utility's websites (i.e., not published in newspapers).

In response, the Commission has historically taken the position that publishing notice in newspapers is the most economical and practical way to ensure that all interested persons are adequately apprised of Commission matters, and the Legislature, in drafting MCL 460.6a(1), did not indicate that a change to this historical practice was needed. Therefore, while MEGA's suggestions may be something to reconsider in the future, given technological advancements, the Commission, at this time, remains firm on its historical stance on this issue, thus requiring utilities to give notice, when required, in newspapers of general circulation in the utility's service territory.

c. Partial & Immediate (P&I) Rate Relief

In its final comments, ABATE suggests that "'known and measurable changes' which support the interim test period [should] be explained and justified, and that [P&I rate] relief [should] be collected under bond and subject to refund to protect ratepayers from over-collection." ABATE's final comments, p. 5. The Attorney General, in his final comments, differently proposes that "parties [should] be allowed to perform limited cross examination of the witnesses on the issues related to P&I at the Hearing to Bind in Testimony," "the Commission [should] require the utility to use the same test year period for requesting P&I rate relief that it used in its main case," "the Commission [should] add to its standards of review the requirement that the utility must show that is has suffered a 'significant revenue deficiency in the historical test,'" and "[t]he Commission should also require that the utility must provide independent and quantifiable evidence to support ['significant revenue deficiency' factors] . . . 1-4 listed on pages 7 and 8 [of the Staff's Final Proposal]." Attorney General's final comments, p. 1. MEGA, however, with regards to the referenced "significant revenue deficiency" factors and the Staff's suggestion that the Commission incorporate factors it may consider in the future, contends that "[i]ncluding . . . limitations goes beyond the concept of 'filing forms and instructions' into the area reserved for formal rulemaking," suggesting that "P&I rate relief [should rather] be handled on a case-by-case basis and that pre-established limitations are not necessary and fall outside the scope of establishing rate case filing requirements." MEGA's final comments, pp. 9-10.

The Commission agrees in part with MEGA and finds that setting forth established factors through the auspices of this order is inappropriate. The Commission further finds that, particularly given the 180-day abbreviated statutory timeframe allotted in P&I rate relief cases, the Staff's schedule, as proposed in the Staff's Final Proposal, is appropriate and, therefore, approved.

d. Historic Year Cost of Service Allocation Study (Exhibit A-6, Schedule F1)

In its final comments, MEGA advances that utilities "do not believe a historic cost-of-service study is useful or necessary for a rate case filing requirement" (MEGA's final comments, p. 10), an assertion Detroit Thermal also shares in its final comments.

The Commission agrees. Accordingly, the Historic Year Cost of Service Allocation Study (Exhibit A-6, Schedule F1) shall be removed from the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements.

e. Projected Capital Expenditure Summary and Supporting Exhibits (Exh. A-12, Sched. B5)

In final comments, the Attorney General suggests that this schedule "should show the amount for the historical test year and the change between the historical test year and forecasted test year," that workpapers should be in Excel format, and that, "[i]f the projected test year is different than the utility fiscal year, th[is] schedule[] shall include a separate column showing the capital expenditures for the stub period between the projected test year and the remaining months to the end of the fiscal year." Attorney General's final comments, p. 2.

Despite considering the foregoing, the Commission finds that providing full 12-month periods directly subsequent to the historic test year will allow for a more useful comparison of the projections included in the rate case to other projected and subsequent actual sources of capital expenditure information. As such, and to achieve this for bridge periods of greater than 12 months, the columns for "10 mos. ending" and "12 mos. ending," under the "Projected" columns for all of Schedule B, shall be transposed as follows:

Historical	Projected		
12 mos. ended 12/31/20xx	12 mos. ending 10/31/20yy	10 mos. ending 10/31/20zz	22 mos. ending 10/31/20zz

f. Projected Operation and Maintenance Expenses (Exhibit A-13, Schedule C5)

The Attorney General, in final comments, suggests that "the Commission should require that the utility include a column for historical year information and also a column for the change from the historical to the projected test year amount," to "facilitate a quick analysis on which areas of major change resources should be focused." Attorney General's final comments, p. 4.

The Commission agrees and finds that adding two columns, as illustrated below, to show the historical values and the change from historical to projected, will be of value to all involved in a rate case:

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Line No.	Description	Source	Historical Operation and Maintenance Expenses ($000)	Change in Operation and Maintenance Expenses ($000)	Projected Operation and Maintenance Expenses ($000)

g. Part III

Tangentially to the "New Filing Requirements" portion of this Order, the Attorney General suggests that the word "Staff" be removed from the "Part III [-] Staff Supplemental Data" heading under "Part I – Exhibits and Schedules," as proposed by the Staff, reasoning that the "information [in Part III] is used by more parties than Staff."[9] Attorney General's final comments, p. 3.

The Commission agrees with the Attorney General, finding that the heading for Part III shall be identified as "Supplemental Data" within the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements. The

[9] In prior comments regarding Part III, the Attorney General also recommended that the opening paragraph of Part III – Forms and Instructions state that "Part III information should be provided to all intervenors in the prior rate case at the same time that the rate case filing, Part I and Part II information is served and to other approved intervenors upon request." Attorney General's initial comments, p. 4.

Commission also finds that the first paragraph of Part III – Forms and Instructions, page 1, shall state as follows:

> The following data is to be provided to Commission Staff at the time of filing of a general rate application and is to be treated as the initial data request meant to facilitate the Commission Staff's audit of historical, bridge, and projected data covering the 12-month historical period ending _____, the bridge period, and the 12-month projected period ending _____. At the time of filing, the utility shall also provide this data to all intervening parties in the utility's preceding general rate case, utilizing the most recent "Service List" from the preceding general rate case to provide such data,[10] along with supplying the same to all other intervening parties in this case promptly upon request, all or a portion thereof capable of being subject to a protective order, if so requested and approved. This information should be used in conjunction with the annual reports filed by the utility with the MPSC (i.e., P-521 and P-522 reports, etc.). The utilities' filed projected rate case amounts should be fully supported within PART 1 of the MPSC's STANDARD RATE CASE FILING REQUIREMENTS.

h. Attachment 5

With regard to Attachment 5, ABATE suggests that "an applicant [should be required to] distinguish between the development of the peak day volume forecast for the total system and each rate schedule's contribution" and that "an applicant's submittals regarding test year design peak day volume should include information regarding the number of customers, rate schedules, and weather data," to "reduce the later discovery burden on all parties." ABATE's final comments, pp. 7-8. Detroit Thermal, contrariwise, contends that the majority of the requirements in Attachment 5 are "burdensome," "prejudicial," or "unreasonable." Detroit Thermal's final comments, pp. 6-7. And MEGA, sharing similar concerns, labels some of the requests within Attachment 5 also as "unreasonable" or "burdensome," in addition to "not relevant" or "unnecessary." MEGA's final comments, Attachment 5, pp. 1-12.

[10] If a prior intervenor's contact information has changed since the last "Service List" in the preceding general rate case was issued, it is that prior intervenor's responsibility to update its contact information on record with the Commission by sending an email to the Commission's Executive Secretary at mpscedockets@michigan.gov.

The Commission disagrees and finds Attachment 5 to be appropriate, as proposed by the Staff. Moreover, until July 31, 2018, this requirement has been waived as a filing requirement, unless otherwise voluntarily filed by a utility at the time of application.

i. Attachment 9

Detroit Thermal, in its final comments, contends that, because Attachment 9 is specific to electric utilities, this attachment "should note that the information requested is only required to be provided by electric utilities." Detroit Thermal's final comments, p. 7. MEGA, on the other hand, generally argues that "several items set forth on Attachment 9 . . . do not provide value to a base rate case," and, in providing specific examples, contends that those items within its specific examples "would be burdensome to compile, and would add very little substantive value to the rate case analysis."[11] MEGA's final comments, p. 15. And the Attorney General, in final comments, suggests that the Commission "should add [in a] paragraph 10 requiring the utility to disclose in an exhibit or workpaper all contingency capital expenditures included in projected capital expenditures by category identified in schedule B-5 and supporting schedules." Attorney General's final comments, p. 5.

In response, the Commission finds value in adding further clarification to Requirement 7f. As a result, Requirement 7f within Attachment 9 shall read, "Provide an anticipated/actual timeline for all the work to be performed, such as a GANTT chart."

j. Attachment 10

Detroit Thermal sets forth the same contention as that made in its final comments with regard to Attachment 9 (i.e., that the attachment is specific to electric utilities and, therefore, should be

[11] MEGA also provides additional, embedded comments within Attachment 9 itself, attached as an attachment to its final comments. See MEGA's final comments, Attachment 9, pp. 4-12.

noted as only being required by the same). MEGA, on the other hand, generally contends that "the items listed on Attachment 10 of Staff's proposed Part III filing requirements is [sic] extremely arduous and does [sic] not establish reasonable parameters on thresholds and details requested" and that "Attachment 10 lacks necessary detail such as what constitutes a group of projects in aggregate."[12] MEGA's final comments, p. 16. And the Attorney General, in final comments, suggests that the Commission "should change the definition of 'non-routine' projects to 'projects that are not routine and recurring annually,'" arguing that "[t]he current definition is too limiting." Attorney General's final comments, p. 5.

The Commission finds merit to the Attorney General's suggestion. Therefore, the Commission finds that the definition of "non-routine projects" shall state as follows:

> **Non-routine projects** are not routine and do not recur annually. Non-routine capital projects are typically undertaken only once in an electric generating facility's remaining lifetime or only once every ten years or longer. Examples of non-routine capital projects include environmental retrofits, major equipment overhauls, and lifecycle management.

The Commission further finds validity to MEGA's contention that Attachment 10 lacks necessary detail. Accordingly, the Commission finds that changing the term "Plant Investment" to "Substantial Plant Investment (SPI)," initially, and "SPI" throughout the remainder, along with modifying the definition of "Substantial Plant Investment (SPI)," as set forth below, will provide further clarity needed for purposes of Attachment 10:

> A **Substantial Plant Investment (SPI)** is a cumulative capital investment on non-routine projects over a five-year period at an electric generating facility. The capital investment threshold for a project or a cumulative capital investment to qualify as an SPI is the lesser of: 1) $50 million or 2) 2% of the annual revenue requirement. The five-year period begins with the filing of the utility's first rate

[12] MEGA also provides additional, embedded comments within Attachment 10 itself, attached as an attachment to its final comments. See MEGA's final comments, Attachment 10, pp. 1-4.

> case that is filed after the final order in Case No. U-18238 that establishes rate case filing requirements is issued.

And lastly, the Commission finds the following changes to Requirement 6 to be appropriate, to avoid the limitation on the environmental compliance studies that were previously implied as being requested in the version of Requirement 6 set forth in the Staff's Final Proposal:

> Provide the final reports of all environmental compliance studies that were undertaken for electric generating units or for projects at electric generating units. Reports more than five years old, or those that were provided in previous rate cases, do not need to be submitted. All supporting spreadsheets and calculations must be provided.

k. Attachment 11

Detroit Thermal, in its final comments, contends that "Attachments [sic] 11 is specific to electric and gas utilities" and, therefore, should "only [be] required to be provided by [the same]." Detroit Thermal's final comments, pp. 7-8. Detroit Thermal further contends that "this Attachment should not apply to small utilities . . . as the compilation of this information would be extremely time consuming and unlikely to assist in the evaluation of a small utility's application for rate relief." Detroit Thermal's final comments, p. 8. On a different note, the Attorney General suggests that the Commission "add a paragraph requiring the utility to disclose in an exhibit or workpaper all contingency capital expenditures included in projected capital expenditures by category identified in schedule B-5 and supporting schedules." Attorney General's final comments, p. 5.

In response, the Commission finds Attachment 11 to be appropriate, as proposed by the Staff, and, again, at least until July 31, 2018, this requirement has also been waived as a filing requirement, unless otherwise voluntarily filed by a utility at the time of application.

l. Remaining Comments/Suggestions

Except as otherwise discussed above, all remaining portions of the Staff's Final Proposal to the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements are being adopted in this order. Therefore, no further discussion regarding any remaining comments/suggestions, or items not in controversy, is necessary.

And last, but certainly not least, the Commission would like to thank all interested parties who participated in this matter. All proposals, comments, and suggestions provided in this docket were greatly appreciated, led to meaningful discussions, and, hopefully, resulted in a work-product that is generally agreeable to and practical for all.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

A. The Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements are approved, as amended.

B. The Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements are effective on the date this order is issued, except for Attachment 1 under Part III, which is effective for all rate case applications to be filed on or after September 1, 2017.

C. Unless otherwise filed by a utility at the time of application, Attachments 2-11 under Part III of the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements are waived as a filing requirement until July 31, 2018.

D. The Commission Staff shall modify the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements to incorporate the amendments identified in this order and shall then upload the same in this docket by August 11, 2017.[13]

[13] Should a utility need the eventual final, adopted version of the Rate Case Standard Filing Requirements, or a portion thereof, during this temporary period, the utility may request it from the Commission Staff at mpscedockets@michigan.gov.

E. The Commission Staff shall reconvene a new collaborative on this matter, to begin to consider alternative filing requirements for small utilities and to discuss the experience and impact of all of the rate case filing requirements set forth in this order with interested parties, by September 2020.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26. To comply with the Michigan Rules of Court's requirement to notify the Commission of an appeal, appellants shall send required notices to both the Commission's Executive Secretary and to the Commission's Legal Counsel. Electronic notifications should be sent to the Executive Secretary at mpscedockets@michigan.gov and to the Michigan Department of the Attorney General - Public Service Division at pungp1@michigan.gov. In lieu of electronic submissions, paper copies of such notifications may be sent to the Executive Secretary and the Attorney General - Public Service Division at 7109 W. Saginaw Hwy., Lansing, MI 48917.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

_____

Sally A. Talberg, Chairman

By its action of July 31, 2017.

_____

Norman J. Saari, Commissioner

_____

Kavita Kale, Executive Secretary

_____

Rachael A. Eubanks, Commissioner